om

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,376	10/07/2003	Paul Marinier	I-2-0411.1US	4627

24374 7590 04/16/2007

VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.
DEPT. ICC
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
KARIKARI, KWASI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/680,376	**Applicant(s)** MARINIER ET AL.
	Examiner Kwasi Karikari	**Art Unit** 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 January 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 10-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S Patent No. 6,704,286 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of claims 10-21 are broadly encompassed by the limitation of claim 1-14 of the U.S Patent No. 6,704,286 and as such it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement the instant application as defined by claims 10-21 in order to perform the modeling of wireless network to achieve a specific service.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 1 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification mentions in Fig. 1, step 11 that the simulation initially starts with an "**empty system**". However, Fig. 1, step 12, mentions that the simulation process picks "**a candidate user**" in following step and "computes the candidates user's interference level" in relationship with "already admitted users" in the system. The Examiner realizes that the "**already admitted users**" language in step 12 contradicts the initial "**empty system**" language in step, because there should be only one candidate in the system in step 12. Furthermore, if the steps 11 and 12 are not clear, then the subsequent steps are in effect affected as well. For examination purposes, the

Examiner will treat the rejected claims in the broadest understanding of applicant's specification. Appropriate correction(s) are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10,11,15-17 and 21 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopalakrishnan et al., (U.S 6,987,729), (hereinafter Gopa).

Regarding claim 10, Gopa discloses a method of simulating the performance of a communication system (= admission control methodology implemented in a processor to carry out communication channel monitoring, data gathering, dynamically allocation of system resources and processing of tasks, see col. 9, line 51- col. 10, line 18; and abstract) which supports transmissions that are received and transmitted by a plurality of users (= any mobiles, see col. 8, lines 31-40), the method comprising simulating possible realizations of a system configuration by performing a plurality of snapshots at specific instances of time (= in the **event** that no mobiles are **currently** seeking admission, methodology step 303, col. 8, lines 8-36; and col. 9, lines 15-24; whereby the **current event of seeking the admission** is being associated with the "snapshots at a specific instances"), wherein the following steps are performed for each snapshot (current event);

(a) starting a current snapshot with an empty simulated system where no users are present (= no mobile is currently seeking admission; i.e., an empty queue, see col. 31-36);

(b) selecting a new candidate user for consideration of admission to the simulated system (= one mobile is seeking for admission, see col. 8, lines 31-49);

(c) computing interference levels (inter-channel interference; reverse-link power allocation, see col. 7, lines 6-63) of the new candidate user each of the timeslots (= signal strength for new user requesting admission is then computed, see col. 8, line 50-col. 9, line 6; and the balance of transmission needs against interference among users as well as constraints in output power for base station, see col. 1, lines 51-67);

(d) invoking a first algorithm to determine whether the new candidate user should be admitted in the simulated system based upon the computed interference levels (= total received signal strength is used to determine updated loading factor; and admission or denial is based on loading, see col. 9,
lines 1-29; whereby the computation, comparison and determination process are being associated with the "algorithm");

(e) if the first algorithm determines in step (d) that the new candidate user should be admitted in the simulated system (= admitting user, see col. 9, lines 21-34):

(el) allocating at least one timeslot (resources) to the new candidate user (= resources allocation; bonus distribution, col. 9, lines 16-29);

(e3) performing a power balancing process to update the transmission power levels of all users admitted in the simulated system (= dynamic adjustment of FER; and management of power output, see col. 1, line 54- col. 2, line 27);

(f) repeating steps (b)-(e) if there are any additional new candidate users to consider for admission to the simulated system (= prospective new user, see col. 9, lines 1-29 and the cited columns in steps b-e (above)); and

(g) ending the current snapshot if there are no more new candidate users to consider for admission to the simulated system (= empty queue, no bonus indicates no further opportunity to admit a new user at the present time; and termination step 314, see col. 8, lines 31-40; and col. 9, lines 15-42); but fails specifically to teach e2) **computing a transmission power level** for the new candidate user based on the **computed interference levels.**

However, Gopa discusses management of power output and the balancing of transmission needs of users against inter channel interference among mobile users as well as constraints in respect to total output power for a base station (see col.1, lines 51-67). Secondary, Gopa teaches an adjustment of power to maintain a require FER in the communication system; and the dynamic allocation of resources to overcome interference (see col. 2, line4-37); and the computation of received signal strength for all users as a prospective new user (see col. 8, line 31- col. 9, line 29).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

Regarding claim 11, as recited in claim 10, Gopa discloses that the method further comprising:

(h) invoking a second algorithm using the interference levels of all of the users admitted to the simulated system (= total received signal strength is used to determine updated loading factor; and admission or denial is based on loading, see col. 9, lines 1-29; whereby the computation, comparison and determination process are being associated with the "algorithm"); and

(i) determining whether the timeslot allocation of any user admitted to the simulated system should be modified (resource allocation, update of loading; and dynamic adjustment of FER, see col. 9, lines 1-43 and col. 10, lines 9-18); but fails specifically to teach **computing the transmission power levels** of users affected by the modified timeslot allocation.

However, Gopa discusses management of power output and the balancing of transmission needs of users against interchannel interference among mobile users as well as constraints in respect to total output power for a base station (see col.1, lines 51-67). Secondary, Gopa teaches an adjustment of power to maintain a require FER in the communication system; and the dynamic allocation of resources to overcome interference (see col. 2, line4-37); and the computation of received signal strength for all users as a prospective new user (see col. 8, line 31- col. 9, line 29).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

Regarding claim 15, as recited in claim 10, Gopa discloses the method, wherein each admitted user has a respective quality requirement, the method further comprising: (h) determining whether each user meets their respective quality requirement (see col. 1, line 51- col. 2, line 27 and col. 7, lines 30-63).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

Regarding claim 16, Gopa discloses a method of simulating the performance of a communication system (= admission control methodology implemented in a processor to carry out communication channel monitoring, data gathering, , dynamically allocation of system resources and processing of tasks,

see col. 9, line 51- col. 10, line 18; and abstract) which *supports* transmissions that are received and transmitted by a plurality of users (mobile users), the method comprising simulating possible realizations of a system configuration by performing a plurality of snapshots of a simulated system at specific instances of time (= in the **event** that no mobiles are **currently** seeking admission, methodology step 303, col. 8, lines 8-36; and col. 9, lines 15-24; whereby the **current event of seeking the admission** is being associated with the "snapshots at a specific instances"), wherein the following steps are performed for each snapshot (current event):

(a) selecting a new candidate user for consideration of admission to the simulated system, wherein the simulated system is already being used by a plurality of admitted users during a current snapshot of the simulated system
(= all users and prospect new user, see col. 8, line 31- col. 9, line 29 and) ;

(b) computing interference levels (inter-channel interference; reverse-link power allocation, see col. 7, lines 6-63) of the new candidate user based on transmission power levels of the admitted users (= signal strength for new user requesting admission is then computed, see col. 8, line 50- col. 9, line 6and the balance of transmission needs against interference among users as well as constraints in output power for base station, see col. 1, lines 51-67);

(c) invoking a first algorithm to determine whether the new candidate user should be admitted in the simulated system based upon the computed interference levels and the transmission power levels of the admitted users
(= total received signal strength is used to determine updated loading factor; and admission or denial is based on loading, see col. 9, lines 1-29; whereby the

computation, comparison and determination process are being associated with the "algorithm");

(d) if the first algorithm determines in step (c) that the new candidate user should be admitted in the simulated system (= admitting user, see col. 9, lines 21-34);

(dl) allocating at least one timeslot (resource) to the new candidate user (= resources allocation; bonus distribution, col. 9, lines 16-29);

(d3) performing a power balancing process to update the transmission power levels of all users admitted in the simulated system (= dynamic adjustment of FER; and management of power output, see col. 1, line 54- col. 2, line 27); and

(e) repeating steps (a)-(d) if there are any additional new candidate users to consider for admission to the simulated system (= prospective new user, see col. 9, lines 1-29 and the cited columns in steps b-e (above); and

(f) ending the current snapshot if there are no more new candidate users to consider for admission to the simulated system (= empty queue, no bonus indicates no further opportunity to admit a new user at the present time; and termination step 314, see col. 8, lines 31-40; and col. 9, lines 15-42); but fails specifically to teach d2) **computing a transmission power level** for the new candidate user based on the **computed interference levels.**

However, Gopa discusses management of power output and the balancing of transmission needs of users against interchannel interference among mobile users as well as constraints in respect to total output power for a base station (see col.1, lines 51-67). Secondary, Gopa teaches an adjustment of power to maintain a require FER in the communication system; and the dynamic allocation of resources to overcome interference (see col. 2, line4-37); and the computation of received signal strength for all users as a prospective new user (see col. 8, line 31- col. 9, line 29).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

Regarding claim 17, as recited in claim 16, Gopa discloses that the method further comprising:

(g) invoking a second algorithm using the transmission power levels of all of the users admitted to the simulated system (= total received signal strength is used to determine updated loading factor; and admission or denial is based on loading, see col. 9, lines 1-29; whereby the computation, comparison and determination process are being associated with the "algorithm" and

(h) determining whether the timeslot allocation of any user admitted to the simulated system should be modified resource allocation, update of loading; and dynamic adjustment of FER, see col. 9, lines 1-43 and col. 10, lines 9-18); but fails specifically to teach **computing the transmission power levels** of users affected by the modified timeslot allocation.

However, Gopa discusses management of power output and the balancing of transmission needs of users against interchannel interference among mobile users as well as constraints in respect to total output power for a base station (see col.1, lines 51-67). Secondary, Gopa teaches an adjustment of power to maintain a require FER in the communication system; and the dynamic allocation of resources to overcome interference (see col. 2, line4-37); and the computation of received signal strength for all users as a prospective new user (see col. 8, line 31- col. 9, line 29).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

Regarding claim 21, as recited in claim 16, Gopa discloses the method, wherein each admitted user has a respective quality requirement, the method further comprising: (g) determining whether each user meets their respective quality requirement (see col. 1, line 51- col. 2, line 27 and col. 7, lines 30-63).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gopa to achieve a system the implement an admission control system that dynamically allocates system resources in order to achieve maximum data throughput for a wireless system and optimal efficiency in the allocation in the system resource.

6. **Claims 12-14 and 18-20 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopa in view of Bruin et al. (U.S 20030060209 A1) (hereinafter Bruin).**

Regarding claim 12, as recited in claim 10, Gopa fails specifically to mention; (ii) dropping each one of the admitted users having an interference level that exceeds an established interference level threshold; and (iii) recording each occurrence of dropping an admitted user as a "drop" event for the purpose of collecting statistics.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Regarding claim 13, as recited in claim 10, Gopa fails specifically to mention;(ii) dropping each one of the admitted users having a transmission power level that does not meet an established minimum transmission power level threshold; and
(iii) recording each occurrence of dropping an admitted user as a "drop" event for the purpose of collecting statistics.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Regarding claim 14, as recited in claim 10, Gopa fails specifically to mention recording a "**block" event** indicating that the new candidate user should be blocked from connecting to the system.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see

Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Regarding claim 18, as recited in claim 16, Gopa fails specifically to mention; (ii) dropping each one of the admitted users having an interference level that exceeds an established interference level threshold; and (iii) recording each occurrence of dropping an admitted user as a "drop" event for the purpose of collecting statistics.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Regarding claim 19, as recited in claim 16, Gopa fails specifically to mention;(ii) dropping each one of the admitted users having a transmission power level that does not meet an established minimum transmission power level threshold; and
(iii) recording each occurrence of dropping an admitted user as a "drop" event for the purpose of collecting statistics.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Regarding claim 20, as recited in claim 16, Gopa fails specifically to mention recording a "**block" event** indicating that the new candidate user should be blocked from connecting to the system.

However, Bruin discusses Dynamic Frequency and Channel Assignment (DFCA); channel planning/modeling and Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) (see Pars. 0009-11 and 0044). Furthermore, Bruin mentions the acceptance and the blocking of new user in the system; that is required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users (see Pars. 0005, 0036-44 and the blocking and acceptance presentation in Figs. 6A and 6B).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bruin with the system of Gopa for the benefit of achieving a system that includes a graphic presentation of the percentage of blocking required to preserve acceptable quality for admitted users in a Power Based Admission Control (PBAC) system (see Bruin; Pars. 0038-41 and Figs. 6A and 6B).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 am - 4pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kwasi Karikari
Patent Examiner.
03/29/2007

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER